

Andrew Kamal
801 W. Big Beaver Road Suite 300-MB #038
Troy, MI 48084
(248) 238-8245
andrew@starkdrones.org

Plaintiff in *pro per*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN COURT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

ANDREW MAGDY KAMAL,

Plaintiff,

vs.

FORD MOTOR COMPANY,

Defendant.

Case No.: 24-12073

NOTICE OF APPEAL

Notice is hereby given that Plaintiff, Andrew Magdy Kamal, pro se, hereby appeals to the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit from the final order of dismissal entered on June 16, 2025 (ECF No. 20), by the Honorable Laurie J. Michelson, United States District Judge, in the above-captioned matter.

The Plaintiff specifically appeals from the Opinion and Order Granting Defendant's Motion to Dismiss [ECF No. 15], which dismissed:

Count I – Wrongful Termination in Violation of Public Policy under Michigan common law; and

Count IV – Violation of the Michigan Whistleblower Protection Act, MCL § 15.361 et seq.

1 The Court held that Plaintiff failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted under
2 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), and entered an order dismissing these claims with prejudice.

3 Plaintiff seeks appellate review of the District Court's findings and conclusions of law, including
4 but not limited to:

5 i. Whether the District Court erred in concluding that Plaintiff's internal report of
6 cybersecurity vulnerabilities and workplace misconduct did not fall within the scope of a "refusal to
7 violate the law" or the exercise of a "right conferred by a well-established legislative enactment" under
8 Michigan public policy law;

9 ii. Whether the Court improperly dismissed Plaintiff's claim under the Whistleblower
10 Protection Act by construing his internal ethics report as insufficient under the "public body"
11 requirement of MCL § 15.362, despite Plaintiff's intent to escalate the complaint to regulatory
12 authorities;

13 iii. Whether the District Court erred in determining that Plaintiff's references to federal law
14 and Ford's internal Code of Conduct did not implicate protected legal standards sufficient to support a
15 public policy claim; and

16 iv. Whether Plaintiff was entitled to amend his complaint to cure any pleading deficiencies
17 before dismissal of the claims with prejudice.
18

19
20
21
22 Dated this 21st day of June, 2025.
23

24 Respectfully Submitted,

25
26 /Andrew Magdy Kamal/

27 _____
28 Andrew Magdy Kamal,
Plaintiff in *pro per*